Effects Determination Criteria Instructions for Gray Wolf

Each Activity Type, Activity Component, and Work Element associated with the proposed action should be compared to the conditional statements to determine which criteria apply to the project. Criteria have been developed that will apply to ALL Activity Types. Individual Activity Types will not have individual criteria.

Criteria are provided based on the applicability of the conditional statements. There are six conditional statements to review, based on the listing status (nonessential experimental populations or endangered) and location of work activities relative to den and rendezvous sites. More than one conditional statement may apply to a single proposed action; be sure to review all conditional statements. Compare the proposed action to the criteria (if applicable), for all conditional statements that are consistent with the proposed action.

The gray wolf is unique among the species covered by the Northwest National Fire Plan Consultation process. There are two separate populations each having different regulatory status. Gray wolves in central Idaho and Southwestern Montana, and those in Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, Idaho and Montana are considered nonessential experimental populations and are not protected in the same manner as wolves designated as threatened. Experimental populations may be treated as threatened species or as species proposed for listing for the purposes of section 4(d), 7, and 9 of the Act. The Service has more discretion in developing management programs for threatened species than for endangered species, especially on matter regarding takings. Management of wolves in the experimental population would not cause major changes to existing private or public land-use restrictions after six breeding pairs of wolves are established in this experimental population area (50 CFR Part 17, 59 FR 60266 and 60252, 11/22/94). The criteria, therefore, developed for nonessential experimental populations vary from those for the endangered populations.

If the final effect of all appropriate conditional statements for all Activity Types, Activity Components, and Work Elements included in the proposed action is no effect, then the project as a whole is no effect to gray wolf. If the final effect, based on all appropriate conditions statements is not likely to adversely affect, (negligible, discountable, or beneficial) or no effect, the proposed action as a whole is not likely to adversely affect the gray wolf.

References

- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1987. Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado. 119 pp.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994a. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Gray Wolves in Central Idaho and Southwestern Montana. Federal Register 60266, 11/22/94.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994b. Final Rule: Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Gray Wolves in Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, Idaho and Montana Central Idaho and Southwestern Montana. Federal Register 60252, 11/22/94.
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1994c. The Reintroduction of gray wolves to Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho; Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Species Code: Gray Wolf

| Activity Component: All Work Element: All | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|--|---|--------------|--|--|--|
| Conditional Statement | Effects Pathway | Potential Effect | Project Criteria | Rationale | Final Effect | | | |
| WHERE WOLF IS EXPERIMENTAL NONESSENTIAL: Project is within a mile of a rendezvous site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment, or mortality | Potentially Adverse | No additional criteria | Special status rule states normal management activities will not jeopardize the continued existence of the population | Discountable | | | |
| WHERE WOLF IS EXPERIMENTAL NONESSENTIAL: Project is within a mile of a den site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment, or mortality | Potentially Adverse | No additional criteria | Special status rule states normal management activities will not jeopardize the continued existence of the population | Discountable | | | |
| WHERE WOLF IS ENDANGERED: Project is within a mile of a rendezvous site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment, or mortality | Potentially Adverse | No activity within a mile of an occupied rendezvous site from April 15 to June 30. | Generally, work activities occurring more than a mile from a rendezvous site during this critical time are unlikely to disrupt and/or inhibit life history behavior to the point of possible abandonment and/or mortality | Discountable | | | |

Sunday, January 13, 2002

Page 1 of 2

| WHERE WOLF IS ENDANGERED: Project is within a mile of a den site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment, or mortality | Potentially Adverse | No activity within a mile of an occupied den site from April 15 to June 30 | Generally, work activities occurring more than a mile from a den site during this critical time are unlikely to disrupt and/or inhibit life history behavior to the point of abandonment and/or mortality | Discountable |
|--|---|---------------------|--|---|--------------|
| RANGE-WIDE: Project is not within a mile of a rendezvous site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment | No Effect | None | Generally, work activities occurring more than a mile from a rendezvous site do not disrupt and/or inhibit life history behavior to the point of abandonment | Negligible |
| RANGE-WIDE: Project is not within a mile of a den site | Disturbance, possible site abandonment | No Effect | None | Generally, work activities occurring more than a mile from a den site do not disrupt and/or inhibit life history behavior to the point of abandonment | Negligible |

Sunday, January 13, 2002

Page 2 of 2